

REMARKS

Applicant's representatives thank the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview earlier today. As we discussed, Claims 1, 10, and 14 have been cancelled, Claims 2-9, 11-13, and 15-17 have been amended, and Claims 18-20 have been added. The new claims and claim amendments are fully supported by the specification. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

AMENDMENTS

Applicant has amended the abstract and specification. The abstract has been amended to reflect the new claims. The specification has been amended to include language from Applicant's provisional application, from which priority is claimed and which has been incorporated by reference in the pending application. No new matter is introduced by the amendments.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ferreira US Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0034661 A1. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant notes that pursuant to the Declaration of January 18, 2005, previously filed, Applicant completed the invention in this country prior to February 14, 2001, which is the effective date of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. US2001/0034661 to Ferreira. While the Examiner correctly points out that the Ferreira utility patent application claims the benefit of Ferreira's provisional patent application No. 60/182,282 filed February 14, 2000, to the extent the utility application includes new matter not

disclosed in the provisional application, Applicant pre-dates the new matter not disclosed in the provisional application.

New Claim 18 recites allowing a user to lineally scroll a navigable image within an internet site by moving a point of view of the navigable image in a direction generally parallel to at least one storefront. Ferreira's provisional patent application does not teach or suggest allowing a user to lineally scroll a navigable image by moving a point of view of the navigable image in a direction generally parallel to at least one storefront.

The Ferreira provisional patent application discloses moving a camera around a fixed point, thereby allowing the user to pan the camera left or right to rotate the camera around the fixed point. See page 5 of the Ferreira provisional patent application. The view provided by the Ferreira provisional patent application is rotated in a corresponding manner; thus, the view is not moved in a direction generally parallel to at least one storefront. Therefore, the prior art fails to teach each and every element of Claim 18.

With regard to Claims 2-9, Applicant notes that each either directly or indirectly depends from Claim 18, which defines over the prior art as discussed above. Therefore, Claims 2- 9 also define over the prior art and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

New Claim 19 recites lineally scrolling a navigable image within an internet site by moving a point of view of said navigable image in a direction generally parallel to at least one storefront of a retail environment. For reasons similar to those discussed above for Claim 18, the prior art fails to teach each and every element of Claim 19.

With regard to Claims 11-13, Applicant notes that each either directly or indirectly depends from Claim 19, which defines over the prior art as discussed above.

Therefore, Claims 11-13 also define over the prior art and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

New Claim 20 recites scrolling images of an actual location as a navigable image on a website and navigating said navigable image in a linear manner by communicating commands from a remote computer to a server computer hosting said website that move a point of view of said navigable image to give a viewer an impression of walking down a street or strolling through a mall while viewing actual store window displays. The Ferreira provisional patent application does not teach or suggest communicating commands that move a point of view of said navigable image to give a viewer an impression of walking down a street or strolling through a mall while viewing actual store window displays.

In the Ferreira provisional patent application, the user may pan the camera left or right to rotate the camera around the fixed point. See page 5 of Ferreira provisional patent application. In the Ferreira provisional patent application, the user may also click on a street horizon hyperlink that takes the user to the next block. See Ferreira provisional patent application, page 3. In the Ferreira provisional patent application, the user may navigate from "one picture to another." See Ferreira provisional patent application, page 2.

As recited by Claim 20, however, images are scrolled to give the viewer an impression of walking down a street or strolling through a mall while viewing actual store window displays. Neither the pan operations of Ferreira nor the street horizon hyperlink operations of Ferreira provide scrolling images while giving the impression of walking

down a street or strolling through a mall while viewing actual store window displays. Therefore, the prior art fails to disclose each and every element of Claim 20.


With regard to Claims 15-17, Applicant notes that each either directly or indirectly depends from Claim 20, which defines over the prior art as discussed above. Therefore, Claims 15-17 also define over the prior art and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 8, 2005

By: 
Michael Malinzak, Reg. No. 43,770
Michael Doerr, Reg. No. 52,825

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MM/MPD/ca